



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

units as M or no such part exists in M. In the former case, M is said to be infinite; in the latter it is finite. It is not difficult to show that this definition does not violate the ordinary conception that the infinite is unlimited, while the finite is limited.

Dedekind was the first (1880) to use this definition of an infinite aggregate or totality as the foundation to establish the science of numbers. Bolzano and others pointed out at an earlier date that infinite aggregates have the property which is here used as a definition. It is now very generally employed, and the mind that can dwell upon it long enough to grasp even the most direct bearings cannot fail to derive from it an unusual amount of pleasure and profit, such as only great thoughts can give.

G. A. MILLER.

Stanford University.

NOTE ON "A BUDDHIST GENESIS."

Since my translation of the Buddhist Genesis document appeared in the January *Monist*, I have found that Rockhill rendered it from the Tibetan in 1884. (*Life of the Buddha and Early History of His Order*. Translated from the Tibetan. By W. Woodville Rockhill. London (Trübner's Oriental Series, 1884). I had known this book for years, but it escaped me when making the Genesis translation and also in my *Buddhist Bibliography* (London, 1903). In Rockhill's volume the Genesis document comes at the very beginning. Like the Sanskritised Prâkrit version used by me, it belongs to the Vinaya Pitaka. The Tibetan Canon is that of the sect of Realists (*Sarvastivâda*), whose account of the compilation of the Scriptures was translated by Suzuki, also in the January *Monist*. There are two versions of the Genesis document in the Tibetan Vinaya Pitaka: A short one in the Vinaya-vastu (corresponding in part to the Pâli Mahâvaggo), and a long one (translated by Rockhill) in the Vinaya-Vibhâga (Pâli Bhikkhu-Vibhangha). The Theravâda sect, who have handed down the Pâli Tripitaka, do not place this document in the Vinaya, but in the Sûtra Pitaka. Thus do we prove the truth of the Island Chronicle of Ceylon, which says that the Realists, the Great Council, and many other sects, made recensions of the Canon to suit themselves. We must never forget that the Pâli, though the oldest version of the Canon known, is by no means the only one. The Mahâsamghika (Great Council) school also claims to be the oldest, and their Book of Discipline has come down to us in a fifth-century Chinese translation. Suzuki also gave us extracts from this, and we saw therefrom that they had no Abhidharma. This looks as if their Canon belonged to an earlier period than the Pâli, for the Abhidharma was in the nature of commentary, and was compiled after the Buddhists had split up into sects. We

know that one ancient sect, the Sautrântikas (*i. e.*, Sûtra-men) refused to admit the canonicity of the Abhidharma and were content with the Sûtra-Pitaka. Moreover, the Great Council sect not only tabooed the Abhidharma, but they also had a very short recension of the Fifth Nikâya. This collection, known as the Khuddaka (Short) in Pâli, was called the Miscellaneous Pitaka by other sects, and consisted largely of commentaries. The Great Council refused to canonize these commentaries, but admitted into it only the Udâna, the Itivuttka and the Nidâna.

It is high time that Japanese scholars translated the books of this early rival sect, which may yet be proved to be older than the Pâli.

ALBERT J. EDMUNDs.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

PRESENT-DAY SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

At a time when so much scientific literature is being issued to the public the questions naturally arise in one's mind, In what direction does this scientific influence tend? Does it make for religion, or does it favor atheism? Probably there never has been a time when an answer in the negative could be so definitely given to the latter question. Indeed, such is the attitude of religion to science that so advanced and broadminded a preacher as the Rev. R. J. Campbell has said: "I believe the next great rehabilitation of the fundamentals of religion will come, not from the side of theology, but from the side of science." This, no doubt, to many, will seem a daring pronouncement to make. Yet, is it not significant of present-day thought?

Such happy relations, however, have not always existed between religion and science. Science has had to battle hard for a recognition of its services to thought and progress, and, like religion, it, too, has had its martyrs. One has only to mention the names of Galileo, Bruno and Antonio do Dominis. Galileo, it is well known, was cruelly treated and imprisoned for promulgating the doctrine of Copernicus that the earth revolved round the sun; Bruno for teaching the plurality of worlds was sacrificed at the stake, and the body and books of Antonio Dominis were taken and burned after his death, because he attributed the colors of the rainbow to natural causes. If ever the fear existed that a knowledge of science was opposed to religion, that fear certainly was rife in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

But what immense strides progress has made! Compare the situation just described with the condition of thought that now prevails, which makes acceptable such an utterance as that of the Rev. R. J. Campbell, quoted at the beginning of this article. He, apparently, has no fear of science being the foe of religion, but rather looks to it as an aid to strengthen men's beliefs in an All-wise Creator. One might say his attitude is that of the welcoming hand of religion to science, and, what is more, it is an appeal made not in